



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/218,783	12/22/1998	PEGGY M. STUMER	98-P-7977-US	2633

7590

03/17/2003

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH  
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

KNOWLIN, THJUAN P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/218,783

Applicant(s)

STUMER ET AL.

Examiner

Thjuan P Knowlin

Art Unit

2642

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires <sup>4</sup> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attachment (Response to Arguments).

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.


8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: Thjuan P. Knowlin  
Phone: (703) 308-1727

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed Mar. 06, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants state that Ayala state that "stations are not divided into groups dependent on physical proximity" (col. 2 lines 22-23), but instead provides a single central office switch which queues calls and then sends paging or public address messages to intended recipients. Thus, teaching away from the present invention, which provides an enhanced network-wide group pickup system. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. As pointed out by Applicants, Ayala teaches that, "stations are not divided into groups dependent on physical proximity" (col. 2 lines 22-33). Therefore, meaning that an individual has the capability to pick up a call from any station, regardless of its location. The individual may be able to access a call even from a geographically distant station, such as a station located in a different building or town (col. 2 lines 25-30). Therefore, providing an enhanced network-wide group pickup system. Applicant further argues features such as "group" server, "group" parking location, and "local and/or remote" group member stations. These features appear in the claims after the final rejection, and will not be addressed by the Examiner. They would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.

*Examiner: Thjuan Knowlin*

  
AHMAD MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600